

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

July 16, 2003

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Bob Barnard called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive.

ROLL CALL:

Present were Chairman Bob Barnard, Planning Commissioners Gary Bliss, Eric Johansen, Dan Maks, Shannon Pogue, Vlad Voytilla, and Scott Winter.

Development Services Manager Steven Sparks, AICP; Consultant John Spencer; and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Barnard, who presented the format for the meeting.

STAFF COMMUNICATION:

WORK SESSION:

Staff will brief the Planning Commission with regard to the status of the City's Design Review Process Update Project that proposes significant updates to the City's current Design Review Process. The Planning Commission is tentatively scheduled for public hearings on this update effort beginning in late August 2003.

Development Services Manager Steven Sparks introduced Consultant John Spencer who is providing assistance with the text amendments for design review, observing that he had also participated in the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) amendments.

Consultant John Spencer briefly described his background in architecture and urban design, noting that he had worked with both the City of Lake Oswego and the City of Portland. He emphasized the necessity of developing what he referred to as quantifiable standards with regard to design review.

1 Mr. Sparks explained that Mr. Spencer had conducted some research
2 with regard to how other jurisdictions address the issue of design
3 review and prepared a matrix illustrating various styles utilized
4 within the jurisdictions. He noted that staff is interested in pursuing
5 an option similar to that utilized within the Transit Oriented districts
6 of Washington County. He discussed the Code Review Advisory
7 Committee (CRAC), observing that this group that is comprised of
8 various interest groups had held 13 meetings in a period of six months.
9

10 Commissioner Maks expressed his opinion that a representative for
11 commercial development would have been an asset to this committee.
12

13 Observing that a Public Open House has been scheduled, Mr. Sparks
14 pointed out that 600 invitations have been distributed to individuals
15 including those developers who have submitted projects within the
16 past two years and various attorneys with an interest in the process.
17

18 Mr. Spencer provided an overview with regard to design review,
19 emphasizing that the current process includes six or seven criteria that
20 have no apparent rationale. He noted that it is appropriate to provide
21 an objective review on a staff level as much as possible. He explained
22 that several key issues are vital with regard to design, as follows:
23

- 24 1. Building Design.
- 25 2. Circulation and Parking.
- 26 3. Landscaping and Open Space.
- 27 4. Lighting.
- 28

29 Mr. Spencer pointed out that the City of Beaverton has no very well
30 developed set of design standards, adding that there are three design
31 categories to address the four key design issues, as follows:
32

- 33 1. Design Principles.
- 34 2. Design Standards.
- 35 3. Design Guidelines.
- 36

37 Mr. Sparks explained that there may be 30 different standards and 30
38 different guidelines with regard to design review, adding that any
39 proposal that does not meet a specific standard would be reviewed at
40 the next level, at which point the guideline would be addressed and a
41 decision rendered by the decision-making body.
42

1 Mr. Spencer noted that staff has proposed a reduction in the total
2 number of thresholds from 76 (current) to 14 (proposed), and explained
3 that four types of design review are proposed, as follows:

- 4
- 5 1. New Building and Site Development.
- 6 2. Minor Design Modifications.
- 7 3. Major Design Modification.
- 8 4. Design Review Compliance Letter.
- 9

10 Observing that the Design Review Compliance Letter replaces a Type I
11 application, Mr. Sparks explained that this is as close as possible to
12 what he referred to as a Type 0. He noted that this would involve
13 approval, stamping and filing, with nearly an immediate turn-around.

14
15 Commissioner Maks expressed his opinion that it is ridiculous for an
16 applicant to be required to go through the review process in order to
17 change plant material on their site.

18
19 Mr. Spencer discussed the thresholds pertaining to new building and
20 site development, observing that a Design Review III would involve
21 those up to and including 30,000 square feet and those up to 50,000
22 square feet where not abutting a conflicting zone. He pointed out that
23 it is often necessary to make what he referred to as a "political call".

24
25 Commissioner Maks discussed issues pertaining to transitional zoning.

26
27 Commissioner Voytilla discussed issues related to use, size, and
28 operation.

29
30 Mr. Sparks referred to the issue of the Bus Barn, observing that there
31 had been issues with the use, rather than the design, of this proposed
32 development. He suggested that any Commissioner with an issue with
33 a standard should provide an alternate standard for consideration.

34
35 8:05 p.m. – Mr. Spencer left.

36
37 Referring to pages 8 and 9, Mr. Sparks noted that these ten specific
38 issues had not been resolved by CRAC. He explained that staff would
39 provide a Staff Report with text condensed into the proper format for
40 the Development Code at the next Work Session.

41
42 Mr. Sparks discussed plans to prepare a Design Review Help Manual
43 for Customers, noting that this document would be approximately 30

1 pages in length and would include photographs, examples, suggestions,
2 and illustrations to provide assistance in the design review process.

3
4 Chairman Barnard expressed concern with the possibility that this
5 might encourage a lot of projects that are very similar in appearance.

6
7 Mr. Sparks agreed that this is always a possibility when providing
8 clear and objective standards.

9
10 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

11
12 Minutes of the meeting of June 18, 2003, submitted. Commissioner
13 Winter requested that lines 25 and 26 of page 3 be amended, as
14 follows: "Observing that the applicant is requesting the removal of
15 four, ~~rather than seven trees requested removal of four~~, rather than
16 seven..." Commissioner Maks requested that line 35 of page 16 be
17 amended, as follows: "Commissioner Maks **requested that the**
18 **Chair** advised Mr. Pinkstaff..." Commissioner Voytilla **MOVED** and
19 Commissioner Winter **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be
20 approved as written.

21
22 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously, with the exception of Commissioners
23 Bliss and Johansen, who abstained from voting on this issue.

24
25 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**

26
27 The meeting adjourned at 8:29 p.m.